

**THE
Masonic Service
Association**

**OF THE
United States**

THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

AUG 5 1942

THE LIBRARY



BULLETIN NO. 2

Library
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

THE FATHERHOOD
OF
GOD

FOREWORD

It is the intention of the Masonic Service Association, acting as the servant of the Member Grand Lodges of the United States, to present a practical and comprehensive program of education which will bring to the membership a clearer understanding of the duties which Masons owe to their Country.

This program is being developed on the basis of an application of Masonic principles to the problems which Masons of the present day are called upon to solve, as individual citizens.

It seems very plain that the development of this program should be along such lines as will cause Masons to make to the present day American civilization the contribution which is contained in the teachings of Masonry. Such a contribution is possible because free speech, free conscience and a statement of the rights of man were introduced into the fundamental documents upon which the American Government is based as a Masonic heritage. The definition of these terms, "free speech" and "free conscience," was made by Masons of the colonial period. The definitions which those early Freemasons placed upon these terms should be the definitions which every true American of today should possess, understand and prize.

In the execution of the task before it, the Executive Commission believes that the proper step to take first is to present the fundamental principles of Freemasonry.

It is believed that each Grand Lodge in its own way will find the brethren, who because of their attainments, are able to present these fundamentals to the lodges.

The present outline is therefore prepared as an aid to these speakers.

The theme of this outline is a development of the Fatherhood of God in terms of Civic Duty.

It is introductory in its nature, and will be followed by others which will develop the subject in more detail.

Suggestions as to methods of using this outline at lodge meetings will appear on the last page of this bulletin.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMISSION.

George L. Schoonover, Chairman,
Anamosa, Iowa

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

I. MASONRY'S ONE DOGMA—BELIEF IN GOD

II. THE BREADTH OF MASONRY'S CONCEPTION OF GOD.

- A. Why narrow conceptions have failed.
 - 1. The Prince of India's conception.
 - 2. Herbert Spencer's effort to found a universal philosophy.
- B. Development of Masonry's Conception.
 - 1. Originators of the statement of the conception.
 - 2. Tolerance of attitude a necessary factor.
- C. Masonry's opportunity and duty to promote religious liberty.

III. PART PLAYED BY MASONS IN THE CREATION OF AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS.

- A. Fundamental principles included in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the State of Massachusetts.
 - 1. Belief in God.
 - 2. Religious Liberty.

IV. THE DUTY OF MASONS TODAY.

- A. Following the example of our Masonic forefathers, to impress these principles upon our modern civilization.
- B. To exemplify them in their daily lives and civic conduct.

V. DOES THIS MEAN ANY CHANGE IN OUR LANDMARKS? NO. IT DOES MEAN

- A. That we approach civic problems, not as lawyers, doctors, bankers, ministers, teachers or politicians, but as Masons, applying to those problems the principles which have been taught in the lodge.
- B. That we broaden our lodge activities to include ritual interpretation as well as ritual instruction.
- C. The practice of our teachings.

VI. THE NEW PHILOSOPHY OF CIVILIZATION.

- A. Cannot rest upon Might or Selfishness.
- B. Man is not independent of his fellow man but is dependent upon him.
- C. Man must not insist upon his rights AGAINST his fellow man, but
 - 1. Must fulfill his duties TOWARD his fellow man.
 - 2. We must demand of our fellow men that they fulfill their duties toward us.
- D. This principle must be made to apply
 - 1. Between Men.
 - 2. Between Cities.
 - 3. Between States.
 - 4. Between Nations.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

ELABORATION OF THE OUTLINE

I. MASONRY'S ONE DOGMA.

Freemasonry has but one dogma. Its tenets and professions teach a system of morality but as far as religious belief is concerned, it asks but one thing of anybody and that is belief in God. The combination of letters with which the name of Deity is spelled is not material. It may be spelled as the Frenchman spells it or the German or the Italian or the Hindu, but belief in a Supreme Being is essential.¹ This is Freemasonry's only dogma.

II. THE BREADTH OF MASONRY'S CONCEPTION OF GOD.

Have you ever read "The Prince of India" by General Wallace? If you will read it, you will find a wonderful book. Before you have read many chapters you will realize that General Wallace was a Freemason.² The marvelous address of the Prince of India to the Emperor Constantine and his court in Book IV, Chapters 15 and 16, ought to be read by every one. This address³ is the culmination in the book of the attempt of the Prince of India to establish a universal religion. This address contains the essence of what the writer of the book would like to say with one exception. The Prince of India failed utterly—failed not because of his basic idea, which was that the whole world might be united in a common religion in the worship of God, but he failed because he demanded that no one should believe anything else. He was unwilling to permit the Christian to believe in Christ. He was unwilling that the Mohammedan should listen to the teachings of Mohammed, or that any one should have any other or further religious belief than his sole dogma.

The great philosopher Herbert Spencer said that if he could find one thing upon which all mankind could agree, he could erect a universal philosophy and he did find that thing, namely that there is something we do not know. Even with his consummate skill he was unable to construct a dominant philosophy upon that one thing because it was a negation. The world has not accepted that philosophy which he attempted to create for the same reason, that a house cannot be built upon quicksand or a monument upon the changing sea.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FREEMASONRY'S CONCEPTION

Through the long centuries of the development of Freemasonry it took on different forms until finally in the early part of the eighteenth century it crystallized as we now know it. Then James Anderson, John Paine and John Theophilus Desaguliers reincarnated the Craft. Then a momentous resolution was adopted by the Grand Lodge of England⁴ which in effect said that no Mason should be charged with any particular religious belief save only belief in a Supreme Being. The adoption of this resolution has given to Freemasonry the greatest opportunity of any institution in the world for it sets forth a common bond upon which all civilized mankind can meet and agree. Upon this single dogma, men owing loyalty to different flags, men believing in different creeds, men adhering to widely divergent sects can meet upon a common ground. Having met upon this common ground, Freemasonry forbids itself and any of its adherents to quarrel within the Lodge room over any of their other religious beliefs or opinions. Postulating belief in God, then each Mason may go further in his religious thought, answerable only to his own conscience, his church and his God.

MASONRY'S OPPORTUNITY AND DUTY TO PROMOTE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

More successful than Herbert Spencer was in his search, Freemasonry has found that single dogma upon which all civilized men can agree and it is the only institution in the world of any consequence which has as yet developed such a common meeting ground. Freemasonry, therefore, not only has the opportunity but also is charged with the duty of attempting to bring about fraternal accord between men of different countries, sects and opinions, because within her walls they may all meet in complete peace and harmony.

III. PART PLAYED BY MASONS IN THE CREATION OF AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS.

It is little known how much Freemasonry had to do with the creation of the institutions of the United States. That is another story with which the Association may well hereafter deal, but it is appurtenant to the present consideration to draw attention to two things which the Freemasons who officered and dominated the convention wrote into the oldest existing written constitution in the world, that of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, adopted in 1780. Two great fundamental principles stand out in the Declaration of Rights contained within that constitution. They are both contained in Article 2 of the Bill of Rights which reads as follows:⁵

"It is the right as well as the duty of all men in society, publicly, and at stated seasons, to worship the SUPREME BEING, the great Creator and Preserver of the universe. And no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping GOD in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; or for his religious profession or sentiments; provided he doth not disturb the public peace, or obstruct others in their religious worship."

In essence these two propositions are

1st, That all civilization must rest upon belief in a Supreme Being; and

2d, That postulating such belief, no man shall be molested in such other religious convictions as he may hold.

IV. THE DUTY OF MASONS TODAY.

If the civilization of our present day is to endure, if the chaos in some parts of our globe is again to be restored to what may be called civilization, if there is to be any peace or harmony or successful future development in the world of today, it must be based upon these two principles which the Freemasons of the eighteenth century wrote into the fundamentals of the creation of Government in America.

These principles are unchangeable landmarks. Our predecessors in Masonry leaving their Lodge room entered into their constitutional conventions and there put down in black and white the great doctrines with which they had been inspired in the ritual of the Fraternity. And these principles are just as essential today as they were in 1780. Yes, more essential. Our predecessors in Masonry builded well when they wrote these declarations in 1780. It is our duty as their successors and as the red blood of the American nation to see to it that these principles are preserved. It is our duty to see to it that the red flag of "No God and no Master" shall not be raised with authority in this our broad land. It is our duty to see to it that we do not interfere with the right of any other man to worship God in any way that he chooses. On the other hand, it is equally our duty to see to it that no man interferes with our right to worship God as we choose, whether he be powerful or weak, whether he be high or low of station, whether he be prince or pauper, whether he be of authority,

civil or ecclesiastical, whether he live in America or in Rome.

V. DOES THIS MEAN ANY CHANGE IN OUR LANDMARKS? NO.

In order that Freemasons may appreciate this responsibility which rests upon them, it is essential that they should know the real underlying doctrines of the Craft and their meaning in the world. It is necessary that they should think of these things outside of and beyond the terms of the ritual.⁷ It is obvious that they should carry the teachings from within the Lodge room into their everyday lives in the world.

VI. THE NEW PHILOSOPHY OF CIVILIZATION.

If Freemasonry can succeed in impressing this new philosophy upon the world existing as it does in many countries among men of many creeds, then we shall feel that we are doing our share towards teaching mankind the new but essential philosophy of civilization, namely, that it cannot rest upon might, power and selfishness, that civilization cannot endure if it shall continue to make declarations of independence so each man shall insist upon his rights against his fellow-men, but, on the other hand, the millenium can only approach when, believing in God, we can make declarations of dependence and act upon the principle of the duties of each to those surrounding him.

Emerson said that the power of love as the basis of a state has never yet been tried. We have tried power of might. We have tried declarations of independence and selfishness and have failed. We shall succeed when the world begins to realize that successful development can only come when bound together in some common bond we shall recognize that fraternal association and shall act upon the principle of our dependence upon each other and our duties toward each

other. Then and only then will Freemasonry have taught its greatest secret to the world. Then and only then shall we realize that noble contention or rather emulation of "Who best can work and best agree." Then and only then, when civilization adopts the teachings of Freemasons, can we have that real happiness which will come from a realization that each man is dependent upon his fellow-man, each city upon its neighbor city, each state upon its sister states, and each nation upon the other nations of the world.

* * *

NOTE TO SPEAKERS

Again let the writer urge upon you a reading of the "Prince of India" from which you will not obtain so much the pleasure of an interesting story as helpful inspiration, particularly if you can read the work with the eye of Masonic thought. Then you can realize the magnificent result which a Prince of India might achieve if his overweening dogmatism had not brought with it the great catastrophe. From the Prince's speeches you will obtain many helpful suggestions and quotations for Masonic addresses.

Give the address as your own. Stick to the underlying theme of the above but embellish it with some stories and illustrative anecdotes. Develop the theme in your own way, but do not fail to make your hearers appreciate

1. Masonry's sole dogma—Belief in God.
2. That Belief in God is an essential landmark of civilization.
3. That Belief in God is the one principle common to all civilized mankind and therefore a bond of union.
4. The necessity for freedom of conscience and religious liberty.

FOOTNOTES

1-A. EXTRACT FROM AN ADDRESS OF MELVIN M. JOHNSON, GRAND MASTER OF MASONS IN MASSACHUSETTS, SEPTEMBER 8th, 1915.

It is an unchangeable Ancient Landmark of the Fraternity that there is but one Masonic dogma. We construct a universal religious philosophy thereupon, as a part of which we teach belief in immortality and endeavor to inculcate other tenets of our profession, but our sole dogma is the Landmark of belief in a Supreme Being, omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, the creating and superintending Power of all things. No man may be a Freemason unless he is a believer in monotheism. No neophyte ever has been or ever shall be permitted vision of our mysteries or reception of our obligations until he has openly, unequivocally, and solemnly asserted this belief. Beyond that we inquire and require nothing of sectarianism or religious belief.

Masonry is cultivating and disseminating the union of mankind upon this common bond to which all may agree, leaving the particular opinions of individuals and their methods of sectarian worship to themselves and to their own consciences, but to be proclaimed and exercised outside of the Lodge-room. Proselyting has its place in the world, but not in the halls of Masonry. Sectarian missionary spirit and its exercise have been of incalculable value to the human race. However much it may be our duty to give it our encouragement and support as individuals or as members of other organizations it is our duty within the Fraternity to see to it that no man may truthfully accuse us of bigotry and in our Lodge-room upon this single bond of belief in Deity to conciliate true friendship among men of every country, sect, and opinion.

By reason of the nature of our population and membership in Massachusetts we are accustomed to recognize the applicability of this principle to Trinitarian and to Unitarian, to Christian and Hebrew, but now that it is in a practical manner called to our attention, we should not be startled when we recognize that it applies alike to other Deists who gain their inspiration from other books than that open before you upon the altar. We may find Monotheism proclaimed not only in the New Testament of the Christian, but also in the Koran of the Islamite, in the Avestas of the Magians of Persia, in the Book of Kings of the Chinese, in the Sutras of the Buddhist, yea, even in the Vedas of the Hindu.

"There is a principle implanted in the heart of man, which prompts him to the belief and acknowledgment of a superior and superintending power, under whatever name he may have been personified; endowed with attributes of infinite knowledge and infinite wisdom. Sophism cannot overwhelm it; philosophy cannot succeed in erasing it from the heart; it is engraven there in characters broad and deep, and spake the same language to the ignorant savage amidst trackless woods and barren wastes, and to the proud philosopher of antiquity, as it did to the learned Jew or the enlightened Christian. It displays a God of nature who loves virtue and abhors vice; and teaches man the doctrine of personal responsibility."

The particular letters by which the name of the Grand Architect of the Universe is spelled or the peculiar way in which His name may be pronounced are as utterly immaterial as to prayers to "Our God" in English, to "Unser Gott" in German, or to "Notre Dieu" in French.

Our attitude is somewhat analogous to these words of the Proclamation of Queen Victoria in Council to the Princes, Chiefs, and People of India (published November 1, 1858):

"Firmly relying ourselves on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of Religion, we disclaim alike the Right and the Desire to impose our Convictions on any of Our Subjects. We declare it to be Our Royal Will and Pleasure that none be in any wise favoured, none molested or disquieted by reason of their Religious Faith or Observances; but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the Law; and We do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under Us, that they abstain from all interference with the Religious Belief or Worship of any of Our Subjects, on pain of Our highest Displeasure.

"And it is Our further Will that, so far as may be, Our Subjects, of whatever Race or Creed, be freely and impartially admitted to Offices in our Service, the Duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity, duly to discharge."

To those of our friends in China who of their own free will and accord may seek Masonic light, whatever their religious belief so long as it includes our single dogma, if they be worthy and well qualified, men freeborn, of good report, and properly vouched for, Freemasonry extends her hand in greeting.

University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Since, then, Freemasonry welcomes to her Fellowship Deists of varying faiths, it is incredible that she should unyieldingly present to such neophytes rites incompatible with their several religious opinions. Necessarily our ceremonies must be sufficiently flexible to yield to the unchangeable Landmark of universality. Otherwise there is presented a problem analogous to the historical inquiry in physics of what will happen when an irresistible force meets an immovable body. When in a given case an Ancient Landmark and a ceremony of the Order are found to be incompatible, something must give way and that something must not be the Ancient Landmark. The ceremony must bend, if necessary. In considering the Dispensation in question and the opportunity offered and likely to be availed of for the reception of candidates who, although Deists, do not adhere to the Holy Bible as the Volume of the Sacred Law, we must now determine whether an obligation may be administered upon any other book and the language thereof adapted to the religion of the candidate. Precedents, however, are at hand. Many of us are aware of occasions within this very building when strictly Orthodox Hebrews have been obligated upon what is known to them as the "Book of the Law," that is to say upon the Pentateuch, and indeed it was determined as early as the year 1806, under the Grandmastership of Most Worshipful Timothy Bigelow, that Quakers could be permitted to affirm.

I know of no Landmark that the Holy Bible is one of the essential furnishings of a Lodge. As I understand the Ancient Landmark in this regard it is simply that the Volume of the Sacred Law is an indispensable part of the furniture of each Lodge, as necessary to the conduct of Masonic work or business by the Lodge as the Charter itself, indeed more essential, if such could be the case, for the Landmark requiring the presence of the Volume of the Sacred Law was established years, if not centuries, before such a thing as a Chartered Lodge was known to the Fraternity. I quote from Mackey's Text-book of Masonic Jurisprudence, (Edition of 1859, page 33), being a part of his chapter entitled "The Landmarks of the Unwritten Law":

"It is a Landmark, that a 'Book of the Law' shall constitute an indispensable part of the furniture of every Lodge. I say advisedly, a Book of the Law, because it is not absolutely required that everywhere the Old and New Testaments shall be used. The 'Book of the Law' is that volume which by the religion of the country, is believed to contain the revealed

will of the Grand Architect of the Universe. Hence, in all Lodges in Christian countries, the Book of the Law is composed of the Old and New Testaments; in a country where Judaism was the prevailing faith, the Old Testament alone would be sufficient; and in Mohammedan Countries, and among Mohammedan Masons, the Koran might be substituted. Masonry does not attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious faith of its disciples, except so far as relates to the belief in the existence of God, and what necessarily results from that belief. The Book of the Law is to the speculative Mason his spiritual Trestle-Board; without this he cannot labor; whatever he believes to be the revealed will of the Grand Architect constitutes for him this spiritual Trestle-Board, and must ever be before him in his hours of speculative labor, to be the rule and guide of his conduct. The Landmark, therefore, requires that a Book of the Law, a religious code of some kind, purporting to be an exemplar of the revealed will of God, shall form an essential part of the furniture of every Lodge."

I am thoroughly in accord with Mackey upon this question. I cannot conceive how otherwise we may follow the words of the old charge: "Though in ancient times Masons were charged in every country to be of the religion of that country or nation whatever it was; yet it is now thought expedient only to oblige them to that religion in which all men agree leaving their particular opinions to themselves."

To the Christian, the Volume of the Sacred Law is the Holy Bible, and upon it he should be obligated. The Christian religion is the prevailing religion of our Lodges and, therefore, the Holy Bible, as the Volume of the Sacred Law, is and must always be part of the furniture of each Lodge. Its sanctity, however, does not appeal to the Islamite, and the ceremony of initiation would lose much to him in binding effect if his obligation should be taken thereon. While the Holy Bible should not be removed from the Lodge, the conscientious Islamite who so desires may be permitted to take his obligation upon the Koran; the Hindu, otherwise qualified and accepted, may be permitted to have the Vedas spread open before him; and the rite of initiation may be so far adapted to the conscience and religious belief of a candidate as to permit his taking the obligation in a manner and form regarded by him as sacred and binding, and upon that work which to him is the Volume of the Sacred Law, providing always that such Volume of the Sacred Law teach Monotheism.

**QUOTATIONS FROM REPORT OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE
PRESENTED BY R. W. ROSCOE POUND, DEPUTY
GRAND MASTER OF THE GRAND LODGE OF MASSA-
CHUSETTS AND DEAN OF THE LAW SCHOOL OF
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, TO THE GRAND LODGE OF
MASONS, DECEMBER 8th, 1915.**

The Committee states the two questions referred to it and reports as follows:

Stated briefly, the first of those questions is with reference to the eligibility of candidates who subscribe to prevailing Oriental religions. This question may be considered with respect to Oriental religions in general, but should also be looked at with respect to Buddhists and followers of Confucius, since it is probable that the matter, so far as this Grand Lodge is concerned, will be only academic as to other creeds. In the case of Mohammedan, Hindu, and Parsee, the question no longer admits of discussion. The practice of the United Grand Lodge of England and its predecessors, undoubtedly for almost a century and a half, would of itself suffice. In 1776, Umdat-ul-Umara, eldest son of the Nabob of Arcot, was initiated at Trichinopoly in a Lodge under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Grand Master for Madras. This reception of a Mohammedan Prince was an event of such significance that it was made the subject of congratulations by the Grand Lodge of England. The Parsees of Western India, so Gould informs us, long ago took an active interest in Masonry, and one of them, Brother Cama, was elected Grand Treasurer of the Grand Lodge of England in 1886. With respect to Hindus, it seems that there was an impression as late as 1860 that they were not eligible for Masonry, and the initiation of a Brahman in Meridian Lodge No. 345, in that year raised a vigorous discussion in the Masonic press. But it should be noted that the discussion did not turn upon any supposed ineligibility of the adherents of Oriental religions, but solely on the question whether the Brahman faith involved belief in God, as Masons understand such belief. The argument of the Master of the Lodge was that "the very groundwork of the Brahman faith is the belief in one Grand Superintending Being." (See *Freemason's Magazine*, April 21, September 8, October 13, 1860; May 18, 1861.) In 1861, two Sikh Princes were initiated, and there does not appear to have been any doubt upon this matter since that time. In 1874 a Hindu was Master of a Lodge under the English constitutions. (See Gould, *History of Freemasonry*, III, 333, 336; Mackey, *History of Freemasonry*, VII, 1982.)

It would belie all our professions of universality if this were not so. We must guard jealously the Landmark—one of the few undoubted and universally admitted Landmarks—that calls for belief in God, the Grand Architect of the Universe. In Brother George F. Moore's well-known paper upon the subject he justly pronounces this the first Landmark in Freemasonry. But the idea of God here is universal. Each of us may interpret it in terms of his own creed. The requirement is not that Masons adhere to this or that theological system or conceive of God in terms of this or that creed. It is a simple requirement of belief in the One God, however manifested, upon which philosophers and prophets and saints and the enlightened religions of all time have been able to agree. It is enough to say that we fully concur in the eloquent and convincing presentation of this matter in the address of the Grand Master.

Perhaps it is superfluous to add anything to the argument from the practice of the premier Grand Lodge and the argument from principle. But if any still harbor scruples it may be noted that except for Hutchinson and Oliver, whose view that Masonry is a distinctively Christian institution obviously can not be admitted, Masonic scholars and teachers have been at one upon this point. In a passage afterward quoted in Webb's Monitor, Preston says: "The distant Chinese, the wild Arab, or the American Savage will embrace a brother Briton [Webb adds "Frank or German"] and he will know that beside the common ties of humanity there is still a stronger obligation to engage him to kind or friendly offices." (Illustrations of Masonry, Bk. 1, par. 3). Certainly we are not to suppose that this Chinaman and this "wild" Arab are Christians. But Preston speaks elsewhere in no uncertain tones: "The doctrine of one God, the creator and preserver of the universe, has been their firm belief in every age; and under the influence of that doctrine their conduct has been regulated through a long succession of years. The progress of knowledge and philosophy, aided by divine revelation, having abolished many of the vain superstitions of antiquity and enlightened the minds of men with the knowledge of the true God and the sacred tenets of the Christian faith, Masons have readily acquiesced in and zealously pursued every measure which could promote a religion so wisely calculated to make men happy. In those countries, however, where the gospel has not reached and Christianity [has not] displayed her beauties, the Masons have pursued the universal religion or the religion of nature; that is to be good men and true, by whatever denomination or

persuasion they have been distinguished; and by this universal religion the conduct of the fraternity still continues to be regulated." (Illustrations of Masonry, 2 ed., 154.) The Grand Master's address has already quoted Mackey upon this subject. A score of passages from Albert Pike might be quoted to the same effect. Let one suffice. After explaining that "these ceremonies have one general significance to every one of every faith who believes in God and the soul's immortality," he proceeds: "In no other way could Masonry possess its character of universality; that character which has ever been peculiar to it from its origin; and which enabled two kings, worshippers of different Deities, to sit together as Masters while the walls of the first temple arose." Finally, we may cite the words of Rev. Joseph Fort Newton, which have the endorsement of the Grand Lodge of Iowa: "While Masonry is theocratic in its faith and philosophy, it does not limit its conception of the Divine, much less insist upon any one name for 'the Nameless One of a hundred names.' Indeed, no feature of Masonry is more fascinating than its age-long quest of the Lost Word, the Ineffable Name; a quest that never tires, never tarries, knowing the while that every name is inadequate, and all words are but symbols of a Truth too great for words—every letter of the alphabet, in fact, having been evolved from some primeval sign or signal of the faith and hope of humanity. Thus Masonry, so far from limiting the thought of God, is evermore in search of a more satisfying and revealing vision of the meaning of the universe, now luminous and lovely, now dark and terrible; and it invites all men to unite in the quest—

One in the freedom of the Truth,
One in the joy of paths untrod,
One in the soul's perennial Youth,
One in the larger thought of God.

Truly the human consciousness of fellowship with the Eternal, under whatever name, may well hush all words, still more hush argument and anathema. Possession, not recognition, is the only thing important; and if it is not recognized, the fault must surely be, in large part, our own. Given the one great experience, and before long kindred spirits will join in the "Universal Prayer" of Alexander Pope, himself a Mason:

Father of all! in every age,
In every clime adored,
By Saint, by Savage, and by Sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord!"

(The Builders, 262-263.)

It remains to consider whether Buddhists and followers of Confucius are believers in God in such sense that they may be made Masons. As to the former, we have the weighty opinion of Albert Pike that Buddha was a "Masonic legislator"—that is that he gave laws in the spirit of Masonry. He says of the original followers of Buddha: "They recognized the existence of a single uncreated God, in whose bosom everything grows, is developed and transformed" (Morals and Dogma, 277.) Professor Rhys Davids, the chief authority in English upon Buddhism, indicates that this may be a matter of dispute. But the committee does not deem it necessary to go into this question, to which it is indeed scarcely competent. For if any Buddhists are to be initiated in International Lodge they will be required to profess belief in God at the outset, and as they will be men in whom our Brethren have confidence and will come well recommended, we may be assured that their professions will be sincere. The same point may be made with respect to the followers of Confucius. But the Rev. J. Legge, an unquestioned authority, tells us that while the teaching of Confucius "was hardly more than a mere secularism" his predecessors on whom he built made abundant reference to the Supreme Being and their writings contain "an exulting awful recognition of Him as the almighty personal Ruler who orders the course of nature and providence." It seems clear that monotheists may follow the ethical teachings of Confucius, even if sceptics may do so likewise, and the former only will be elected to receive the mysteries of Freemasonry.

The second question, put briefly, is with reference to the adaptability of our rites when applied to adherents of Oriental religions. Here again we may appeal to the settled and unquestioned practice of the United Grand Lodge of England. In response to a request for information addressed to him by the R. W. Grand Secretary, Sir Edward Letchworth, Grand Secretary of the English Grand Lodge, writes, under date of October 25, 1915: "Adverting to your letter to me of the 11th instant, it has always been the practice of this Grand Lodge to permit Candidates for Freemasonry who are believers in a Supreme Being, but not in the Christian Religion, to be obligated upon the Sacred Book of their own Religion. Thus Jews are obligated on the Old Testament, Mohammedans on the Koran, Hindus on the Vedas, and Parsees on the Zendavesta."

On principle this must be the sound practice. It is indeed but a corollary of the proposition involved in the first question. Moreover the testimony of Ma-

sonic scholars is clear. The M. W. Grand Master has already quoted from Mackey's Masonic Jurisprudence. In another work Dr. Mackey says: "Masonically the book of the law is that sacred book which is believed by the Mason of any particular religion to contain the revealed will of God; although technically among the Jews the Torah, or Book of the Law, means only the Pentateuch or five books of Moses. Thus to the Christian Mason the Book of the Law is the Old and New Testaments; to the Jew the Old Testament; to the Mussulman the Koran; to the Brahman, the Vedas; and to the Parsee the Zendavesta." In the Entered Apprentice Lecture, as written by Albert Pike, he says:

"The Holy Bible, Square, and Compass, are not only styled the Great Lights in Masonry, but they are also technically called the Furniture of the Lodge; and, as you have seen, it is held that there is no Lodge without them. This has sometimes been made a pretext for excluding Jews from our Lodges, because they can not regard the New Testament as a holy book. The Bible is an indispensable part of the furniture of a Christian Lodge, only because it is the sacred book of the Christian religion. The Hebrew Pentateuch in a Hebrew Lodge, and the Koran in a Mohammedan one, belong on the Altar; and one of these, and the Square and Compass, properly understood, are the Great Lights by which a Mason must walk and work.

"The obligation of the candidate is always to be taken on the sacred book or books of his religion, that he may deem it more solemn and binding; and therefore it was that you were asked of what religion you were. We have no other concern with your religious creed." (Morals and Dogma, 11.)

Much more might be cited from Masonic writers of authority. But the practice of more than a century in the Grand Lodge of England and the principle of the thing require no other support.

The committee would report that the conclusions of the M. W. Grand Master upon the two questions referred are, in our opinion, beyond controversy, being sustained by long precedent and usage, by the clearest deduction from the fundamental tenets of the Fraternity, and by the concurrent testimony of Masonic scholars.

Fraternally submitted,

EDWIN B. HOLMES,
ROSCOE POUND,
LEON M. ABBOTT,
FREDERICK W. HAMILTON,
R. PERRY BUSH,

Committee.

1-b. Among the appellations by which the Deity is referred to in the Masonic Manual are the following:

Supreme Ruler of the Universe.	Divine Providence.
Supreme Grand Master.	Divine Creator.
Supreme Architect of the Universe.	Creator.
Supreme Intelligence.	All-Seeing Eye.
Grand Artificer of the Universe.	Lord
Almighty Father of the Universe.	God.
Almighty Parent.	Judge Supreme.
	Deity.

2. Read particularly first three chapters of Book I.

General Lew Wallace was made a Mason at Covington, Indiana, in 1851. At the time of his death, February 15, 1905, and for some ten years previously, he had been a member of Montgomery Lodge No. 50, at Crawfordsville, Indiana.

3. With the Holy Bible opened before him the Prince of India said, "This is the Bible, the most Holy of Bibles. I call it the rock on which your faith and mine are castled. . . . These are Bibles also, Bibles sacred to those unto whom they were given as that imperishable monument to Moses and David is to us; for they too are Revelations from God—aye, the very same God! This is the Koran, and these, the Kings of the Chinese—and these, the Avesta of the Magians of Persia—and these, the Sutras well preserved of Buddha—and these, the Vedas of the patient Hindoos, my countrymen. . . . Your Majesty, these are but secondary matters; yet there is such light in them with respect to my main argument, that I think best to make them good by proofs, lest my reverend brethren dismiss me as an idler in words. . . . Behold the Bible of the Bodhisattwa, and hear, while I read from it, of a Birth, Life and Death which took place a thousand and twenty-seven years before Jesus Christ was born." And he read:

"'Strong and calm of purpose as the earth, pure in mind as the water lily, her name figuratively assumed, Maya, she was in truth above comparison. On her in likeness as the heavenly queen the Spirit descended. A mother, but free from grief or pain, she was without deceit.'" The Prince stopped reading to ask: "Will not my Lord see in these words a Mary also 'blessed above other women'?" Then he read on:

"'And now the Queen Maya knew her time for the birth had come. It was the eighth day of the

fourth moon, a serene and agreeable season. While she thus religiously observed the rules of a pure discipline, Bodhisattwa was born from her right side, come to deliver the world, constrained by great pity, without causing his mother pain or anguish.'" Again the Prince lifted his eyes from the roll. "What is this, my Lord, but an incarnation? Hear now of the Child. . . . 'As one born from recumbent space, and not through the gates of life, men indeed regarded his exceeding great glory, yet their sight remained uninjured; he allowed them to gaze, the brightness of his person concealed for a time, as when we look upon the moon in heaven. His body nevertheless was effulgent with light, and, like the sun which eclipses the shining of the lamp, so the true god-like beauty of Bodhisattwa shone forth and was everywhere diffused. Upright and firm, and unconfused in mind, he deliberately took seven steps, the soles of his feet resting evenly upon the ground, as he went, his footmarks remained bright as seven stars. Moving like the lion, king of beasts, and looking earnestly toward the four quarters, penetrating to the center the principles of truth, he spoke thus with the fullest assurance: This birth is in the condition of Buddha; after this I have done with renewed birth; now only am I born this once, for the purpose of saving all the world.'" A third time the Prince stopped, and throwing up his hand to command attention he asked: "My Lord, who will say this was not also a Redeemer? See now what next ensued"—and he read on: "'And now from the midst of Heaven there descended two streams of pure water, one warm, the other cold, and baptized his head.'" Pausing again, the speaker searched the faces of his auditors on the right and left, while he exclaimed in magnetic repetition: "Baptism—Baptism—BAPTISM AND MIRACLE! . . .

"Suffer me to help my Lord yet a little more," the Prince continued. "He remembers angels came down the night of the nativity in the cave by Bethlehem; he cannot forget the song they sung to the shepherds. How like these honors to the Bodhisattwa!"—and he read from the roll: . . . "'Meanwhile the Devas—angels, if my Lord pleases—the Devas in space, seizing their jewelled canopies, attending, raise in responsive harmony their heavenly songs to encourage him.' Nor was this all, my Lord," and he continued reading: "'On every hand the world was greatly shaken. . . . The minutest atoms of sandal perfume, and the hidden sweetness of precious lilies, floated on the air, and rose through space, and then commingling came back to earth. . . . All cruel and

malevolent kinds of beings together conceived a loving heart; all diseases and afflictions amongst men, without a cure applied, of themselves were healed; the cries of beasts were hushed; the stagnant waters of the river courses flowed apace; no clouds gathered on the heavens, while angelic music, self-caused, was heard around. . . . So when Bodhisattwa was born, he came to remove the sorrows of all living things. Mara alone was grieved.' O my reverend brethren!" cried the Prince, fervently, "who was this Mara that he should not share in the rejoicing of all nature else? In Christian phrase, Satan, and Mara alone was grieved.

"Do the likenesses stop with the births, my brethren are now asking. Let us follow the Bodhisattwa. On reaching the stage of manhood he also retired into the wilderness. 'The valley of the Se-na was level and full of fruit trees, with no noxious insects,' say these Scriptures, 'and there he dwelt under a sala tree. And he fasted nigh to death. The Devas offered him sweet dew, but he rejected it and took but a grain of millet a day.' Now what think you of this as a parallel incident of his sojourn in the wilderness?" And he read: . . . "'Mara Devaraga, enemy of religion, alone was grieved, and rejoiced not. He had three daughters, mincingly beautiful, and of a pleasant countenance. With them, and all his retinue, he went to the grove of 'fortunate rest,' vowing the world should not find peace, and there'—the Prince forsook the roll—"and there he tempted Bodhisattwa, and menaced him, a legion of devils assisting.' The daughters, it is related, were changed to old women, and of the battle this is written: . . . 'And now the demon host waxed fiercer, and added force to force, grasping at stones they could not lift, or lifting them they could not let them go; their flying spears stuck fast in space refusing to descend; the angry thunder-drops and mighty hail, with them, were changed into five-colored lotus flowers; while the foul poison of the dragon snakes was turned into spicy-breathing air'—And Mara fled, say the Scriptures, fled gnashing his teeth, while Bodhisattwa reposed peacefully under a fall of heavenly flowers." The Prince, looking about him after this, said calmly: "Now judge I by myself; not a heart here but hears in the intervals of its beating, the text: 'Then was Jesus lead up by the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil'—and that other text: 'Then the devil leaveth him, and behold, angels came and ministered unto him.' Verily, my Lord, was not the Spirit the same Spirit, and did it not in both incarnations take care of its own? . . .

"It would not become me, my Lord, to assume an appearance of teaching you and this audience, most learned in the Gospels, concerning them, especially the things said by the Blessed One of the later Incarnation, whom we call The Christ. We all know the Spirit for which he was both habitation and tongue, came down to save the world from sin and hell; we also know what he required for the salvation. So, even so, did Bodhisattwa. Listen to him now—he is talking to his Disciples: . . . 'I will teach you,' he said, to the faithful Ananda, 'a way of Truth, called the Mirror of Truth, which, if an elect disciple possess, he may himself predict of himself, "Hell is destroyed for me, and rebirth as an animal, or a ghost, or any place of woe. I am converted. I am no longer liable to be reborn in a state of suffering, and am assured of final salvation." . . . Ah, your Majesty is asking, will the parallel never end? Not yet, not yet! For the Bodhisattwa did miracles as well. I read again: . . . 'And the Blessed One came once to the river Ganges, and found it overflowing. Those with him, designing to cross, began to seek for boats, some for rafts of wood, while some made rafts of basket-work. Then the Blessed One, as instantaneously as a strong man would stretch forth his arm and draw it back again when he had stretched it forth, vanished from this side of the river, and stood on the further bank with the company of his brethren.' . . .

"My Lord and Reverend Sirs, the fullness of the parallel I have run between the Bodhisattwa, Son of Maya, and Jesus Christ, Son of Mary, may lead to a supposition that they were the only Blessed Ones who have appeared in the world honored above men because they were chosen for the Incarnation of the Spirit. In these Scriptures," unrolling the Sutra or Book of the Great Decease—"frequent statements imply a number of Tathagatas or Buddhas of irregular coming. In this"—putting a finger on a Chinese King—"time is divided into periods termed Kalpas, and in one place it is said ninety-eight Buddhas illuminated one Kalpa—that is, came and taught as Saviours. Nor shall any man deny the Spirit manifest in each of them was the same Spirit. They preached the same holy doctrine, pointed out the same road to salvation, lived the same pure unworldly lives, and all alike made a declaration of which I shall presently speak; in other words, my Lord, the features of the Spirit were the same in all of them. . . . Here in these rolls, parts of the Sacred Books of the East, we read of Shun. I cannot fix his days, they were so long ago. Indeed, I only know he must

have been an adopted of the Spirit by his leaving behind him the Tao, or Law, still observed among the Chinese as their standard of virtue. . . . Here also is the Avesta, most revered remains of the Magi, from whom, as many suppose, the Wise Men who came up to Jerusalem witnesses of the birth of the new King of the Jews were sent. Its teacher is Zarathustra, and, in my faith, the Spirit descended upon him and abode with him while he was on the earth. The features all showed themselves in him—in his life, his instruction, and in the honors paid him through succeeding generations. His religion yet lives, though founded hundreds of years before your gentle Nazarene walked the waters of Galilee. . . . And here, oh my Lord, is a book abhorred by Christians—he laid his whole hand on the Koran—"How shall it be judged? By the indifferent manner too many of those ready to die defending its divine origin observe it? Alas! What religion shall survive that test? In the visions of Mohamet I read of God, Moses, the Patriarchs—nay, my Lord, I read of him called the Christ. Shall we not beware lest in condemning Mohamet we divest this other Bible"—he reverently touched the great Eusebian volume—"of some of its superior holiness? He calls himself a Prophet. Can a man prophesy except he have in him the light of the Spirit? . . .

"Now, my Lord, I shall advance a step nearer my real subject. Think not, I pray, that the things I have spoken of the Bodhisattwa, of Shun, of Zarathustra, of Mohamet, likening them in the entertainment of the Spirit to Jesus, was to excite comparisons; such as which was the holiest, which did the most godly things, which is the most worthy to be accounted the best beloved of the Father; for I come to bury all strife of the kind. . . . I said I had been to the mountain's top; and now, my Lord, did you demand of me to single out and name the greatest of the wonders I thence beheld, I should answer: "Neither on the sea, nor on the land, nor in the sky is there a wonder like unto the perversity which impels men to invent and go on inventing religions and sects, and then persecute each other on account of them. And when I prayed to be shown the reason of it, I thought I heard a voice, 'Open thine eyes—See!' . . . And the first thing given me to see was that the Blessed Ones who went about speaking for the Spirit which possessed them were divine; yet they walked the earth, not as Gods, but witnesses of God, asking hearing and belief, not worship; begging men to come unto them as guides sent to show them the only certain way to everlasting life in glory—

only that and nothing more. . . . The next thing I saw, a bright light in a white glass set on a dark hill, was the waste of worship men are guilty of in bestowing it on inferior and often unworthy objects. When Jesus prayed it was to our Father in Heaven, was it not—meaning not to himself or anything human—or anything less than human. . . . One other thing I was permitted to see; and the reserving it last is because it lies nearest the proposal I have come a great distance to submit to my Lord and these most reverend brethren in holiness. Every place I have been in which men are not left to their own imaginings of life and religion—in every land and island touched by revelation—a supreme God is recognized, the same in qualities—Creator, Protector, Father—Infinite in Power, Infinite in Love—the Indivisible One! Asked you never, my Lord, the object he had in intrusting his revelation to us, and why the Blessed Ones, his Sons in the Spirit, were bid come here and go beyond by stony paths? Let me answer with what force is left me. There is in such permissions but one intention which a respectful mind can assign to a being great and good as God—one altar, one worship, one prayer, and He the soul of them. With a flash of his beneficent thought he saw in one religion peace amongst men. Strange—most strange! In human history no other such marvel! There has been nothing so fruitful of bickering, hate, murder and war. Such is the seeming, and so I thought, my Lord, until on the mountain's highest peak, whence all concerns lie in view below, I opened my eyes and perceived the wrestling of tongues and fighting were not about God, but about forms, and immaterialities, more especially the Blessed Ones to whom He had intrusted his Spirit. From the Ceylonesian: 'Who is worthy praise but Buddha?' 'No,' the Islamite answers: 'Who but Mohamet?' And from the Parsee: 'No,—Who but Zarathustra?' 'Have done with your vanities,' the Christian thunders: 'Who has told the truth like Jesus?' Then the flame of swords, and the cruelty of blows—all in God's name! . . .

"This from the Judean Bible: 'And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM; and he said, This shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.' Thus did God, of whom we have no doubt, name himself to one chosen race. . . . Next from a holy man of China who lived nearly five hundred years before the Christ was born: 'Although any one be a bad man, if he fasts and is collected, he may indeed offer sacrifices unto God.' And from the Avesta, this of the creed of the Magi: 'The

world is twofold, being the work of Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu; all that is good in the world comes from the First Principle (which is God) and all that is bad from the latter (which is Satan). Angra Mainyu invaded the world after it was made by Ahura Mazda and polluted it, but the conflict will some day end.' The First Principle here is God. But most marvellous, because of the comparison it will excite, harken to this from the same Magian creed: 'When the time is full, a son of the lawgiver still unborn, named Saoshyant, will appear; then Angra Mainyu (Satan) and Hell will be destroyed, men will arise from the dead, and everlasting happiness reign over the world.' Here again the Lawgiver is God; but the Son—who is he? Has he come? Is he gone? Next, take these several things from the Vedas: 'By One Supreme Ruler is the universe pervaded, even every world in the whole circle of nature. There is One Supreme Spirit which nothing can shake, more swift than the thought of man. The Primeval Mover even divine intelligence cannot reach; that Spirit, though unmoved, infinitely transcends others, how rapid soever their course; it is distant from us, yet very near; it pervades the whole system of worlds, yet is infinitely beyond it.' Now, my Lord and very reverend sirs, do not the words quoted come to us clean of mystery? Or have you the shadow of a doubt whom they mean, accept and consider the prayer I read you now from the same Vedas: 'O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, Thou sole mover of all, Thou who restrainest sinners, who pervadest yon great luminary which appearest as the Son of the Creator; hide thy struggling beams and expand thy spiritual brightness that I may view thy most auspicious, most glorious, real form. OM, remember me, divine Spirit! OM, remember my deeds! Let my soul return to the immortal Spirit of God, and then let my body, which ends in ashes, return to dust.' Who is OM? Or is my Lord yet uncertain, let him heed this from the Holiest Verse of the Vedas: 'Without hand or foot, he runs rapidly, and grasps firmly; without eyes, he sees; without ears, he hears all; he knows whatever can be known, but there is none who knows him: Him the wise call the Great, Supreme, Pervading Spirit.' Now, once more, O my Lord, and I am done with citation and argument. Ananda asked the Bodhisattwa what was the Mirror of Truth, and he had this answer: "It is the consciousness that the elect disciple is in this world possessed of faith in Buddha, believing the Blessed One to be the Holy One, the Fully Enlightened One, Wise, Upright, Happy, World-knowing,

Supreme, the bridler of men's wayward hearts the Teacher of Gods and men—the Blessed Buddha.' Oh, good my Lord, a child with intellect barely to name the mother who bore him, should see and say, 'Here God is described.' . . .

"Whether this idea of God is broad enough to accommodate all the religions grown up on the earth, I will not argue; for I desire to be most respectful"—thus the speaker went on in his natural manner. "But should you accept it as enough, you need not be at loss for a form in which to put it. 'Master,' the lawyer asked, 'which is the great commandment in the law?' And the Master answered: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind'; and he added: 'This is the first and great commandment.' My Lord, no man else ever invented, nor shall any man ever invent, an expression more perfectly definitive of the highest human duty—the total of doctrine."

—"Prince of India," Book IV, Chapters 15, 16.

4. This resulted in a change in that part of the old Constitutions entitled "concerning God and Religion" and we find it as follows:

"A Mason is oblig'd, by his Tenure, to obey the moral Law; and if he rightly understands the Art, he will never be a stupid Atheist, nor an irreligious Libertine. But though in ancient Times Masons were charg'd in every Country to be of the Religion of that Country or Nation, whatever it was, yet 'tis now thought more expedient only to oblige them to that Religion in which all Men agree, leaving their particular Opinions to themselves; that is, to be good Men and true, or Men of Honour and Honesty, by whatever Denominations or Persuasions they may be distinguish'd; whereby Masonry becomes the Center of Union, and the Means of conciliating true Friendship among Persons that must have remain'd at a perpetual Distance."

5. See also Articles of Confederation; Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence; First twelve amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

6. "Bolshevism is first and foremost the practical denial of the spiritual. They flatly refuse to admit the existence of any spiritual bond between man and man. For them economic and material interests constitute the only social nexus; they recognize no other. This is the source of their whole conception of human society. The love of country, for example, is a lying, hypocritical pretense; for the national bond is a spiritual bond, and therefore wholly factitious.

"From their point of view the only real bond between men is the material—that is to say, the economic. Material interests divide men into classes, and they are the only divisions to be taken account of. Hence they recognize no Nations save the Rich and the Poor. As there is no other bond which can unite these two Nations into one social whole, their relations must be regulated exclusively by the zoölogical principle revealed in the struggle for existence.

"The materialistic conception of society is the Bolshevik method of treating the family. Since there is no spiritual bond between the sexes, there can be no constant relation. The rule is therefore that men and women can change their partners as often as they wish. The authorities in certain districts have even proclaimed the 'nationalization' of women, that is, the abolition of any private and exclusive right to possess a wife even for a limited period, on the ground that women are the property of all. The same with children. A powerful current of opinion is urging that children must be taken from their parents in order that the State may give them an education on true materialistic lines. In certain communes some hundreds of children were 'nationalized,' that is, taken from their parents and placed in public institutions."

—Eugene Troubetzkoy, Professor of Law, University of Moscow. (In the Hibbert Journal, January, 1920.)

7. The most crying need in all countries today is that national, state and local problems shall be discussed and settled on the basis of the general welfare of all the people and not of any particular class. It is not unreasonable that in approaching problems, particularly those which are of a civic character and which affect us more or less directly, we should think of them as we are likely to think about every thing else, from the angle of our own particular calling or profession. This applies whether we are lawyers, doctors, bankers, ministers, teachers or politicians.

The application of Masonic principles, however, contemplates thinking of these problems in terms of the general good. The task of each individual Mason therefore is to enter into the Masonic atmosphere and consider these problems from a thoroughly unselfish viewpoint, permitting himself to be guided by the fundamental principles revealed in the Ritual. These principles are old, and the Masonic expression of them was born in the travail of the human race seeking to find its way to liberty. The principles do not need to be changed. It is for us as broad-minded citizens to apply the principles.

A FEW SUGGESTIONS AS TO MEETINGS AT WHICH THIS OUTLINE IS USED

1. This talk is intended to occupy not more than 45 minutes, and speakers who intend to expand their remarks in covering the outline should bear this in mind. The text of the manuscript as written can be read intelligently in about twenty minutes.
2. A typical program at which this talk is given could be arranged satisfactorily somewhat after the following manner:
 - a. Call to order.
 - b. Introduction of the speaker. 3 minutes.
 - c. The talk given as outlined. 45 minutes.
 - d. Discussion of the subject by three or four brethren, each of whom has been given in advance one of the sub-heads in the outline as a topic, so that he can prepare for the discussion. 20 minutes.
 - e. Informal discussion, by brethren present at the meeting. 40 minutes.
 - f. Adjournment.

This would occupy in the neighborhood of two hours. Introduction of entertainment or musical numbers will seldom help a serious discussion.

3. A program of this character could be readily arranged for a banquet or refreshment table, if desired, but as a rule refreshments (if any) should follow the meeting.
4. No ritualistic work should be done on the same evening that this kind of a program has been planned. Get your membership to look forward to "Masonic Service Meetings" by making them worth while and strictly Masonic.
5. Take particular pains to see that younger members are urged to come to these meetings. They will receive the greatest benefit, and their interest in all Lodge affairs will be increased as a result.
6. Tell your Grand Lodge Committee how the program was received, and offer suggestions that you think will help in carrying out other meetings of like kind.
7. Give your "Masonic Service Meetings" prominent publicity—the more directly your publicity reaches the Craft the better.